

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants acknowledge, with thanks, receipt of the office action dated October 30, 2007. Claims 1-26 were pending.

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner stated that claims 1, 11, and 21 recite the receipt of registration data including “data corresponding to a secure data communication path between the server and the remote data processing device.” It was the Examiner’s opinion that specification does not disclose such data being part of the registration process. The applicants respectfully traverse. The specification discloses that a system administrator will register each system with the server to receive hot fixes. As stated in the specification, “In other words, the system administrator establishes a secure connection 110 from the server 108, or the network 104 to the server 102 using SSL over HTTP and registers each system 108, 112, 114, 116, and 118.” See page 4, lines 27-30. The specification further discloses:

It is while registering each system 108, 112, 114, 116, and 118 that the customer site 150 system administrator gives appropriate credentials to the server 102 to enable authentication with each system 108, 112, 114, 116, and 118 on the local area network 104. As will be appreciated by those skilled in the art, suitable credentials may, for example, be a username and password combination, digital certificate, digital signatures or other verification means.

Page 5, lines 4-9. As such, data corresponding to the secure connection between the server and the remote data processing device as well as the credentials needed to access such secure connection are provided with registration data. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.


The Examiner also stated that claims 1, 11, and 21 were amended to recite “registration means, disposed in the server, adapted for receiving registration data at each of a plurality of remote data processing devices specific thereto.” It was the Examiner’s opinion that the specification did not disclose any structure that resides in the server but receives data at the remote data processing devices. The Applicants respectfully traverse this conclusion. From the above-quoted excerpt from the specification, it will be appreciated that the credentials are given *to the server* to allow for authentication. Notwithstanding, Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to recite that the registration means receive registration data from each of the plurality of remote data processing devices. As such, this rejection should be overcome.

Claims 1-10 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As noted above, claims 1 and 21 were amended to recite registration means, disposed in the server, adapted for receiving registration data at each of a plurality of remote data processing devices specific thereto.” Claims 1 and 21 have been amended to recite that the registration means receive registration data from each of the plurality of remote data processing devices. As such, this rejection should be overcome.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/31278.

Date: 1/3/08

Respectfully submitted,



Susan M. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3466
Fax: (216) 592-5009